

REMARKS

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 13, 19, and 56 are in this application. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 20-55 and 57-70 have been canceled. The Applicant preserves his right to file one or more continuation applications directed to any or all of the canceled claims.

Claims 1-10, 49-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As previously indicated, claims 1-10 and 49-53 have been canceled.

Claims 1-12, 14-18, 20-22, 29, 37, 41, 49-55, and 57-59, and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minechika et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,494) in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,477 B1). As previously indicated, claims 1-12, 14-18, 20-22, 29, 37, 41, 49-55, and 57-59, and 67 have been canceled.

Claims 23, 30, 45 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Minechika et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,494). As previously indicated, claims 23, 30, 45 and 60 have been canceled.

Claims 38-40, 42-44 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minechika et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,494) in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,477 B1), and further in view of Itakura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,149). As previously indicated, claims 38-40, 42-44 and 68-70 have been canceled.

Claims 13, 19 and 56 were allowed over the prior art.

This is in response to the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, included in the present Office Action. To the extent the Examiner's statement states, implies or is construed to mean that claims 13, 19 and 56 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner believes the claims should be interpreted to include one or more features or limitations not recited therein, Applicant's attorney disagrees with such an interpretation. Moreover, it is Applicant's contention that there is no particular limitation in the allowed claims that is more critical than any other. The issuance of the Examiner's statement should not be construed as a surrender by Applicant of any subject matter. It is the intent of Applicant, by his attorney, to construe the allowed claims so as to cover the invention disclosed in the instant application and all equivalents to which the claimed invention is entitled.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are allowable, and an early official notice to that effect is solicited.

Please charge any additional fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800